REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 10-18 were allowed and claim 6 was substantively rejected under § 102. Claims 7-9 were objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claim 6, but were stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Rejected claim 6 is now amended to include the subject matter of allowable dependent claim 7 (claim 7 is canceled without prejudice to reentry), so claim 6 should now be allowable.

Allowable claim 8 is rewritten in independent form and should now be allowable.

Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and should be allowable.

New claims 19 and 20 are supported in the drawing and specification. No new matter is introduced. New claim 19 combines the subject matter of claim 8 with a version of claim 6 in which "constant modulus algorithm" is replaced by "first algorithm" and "multi-modulus algorithm" is replaced by "second algorithm." The new claim is patentable for including the subject matter of allowable claim 8. Claim 20 is allowable for, *inter alia*, depending from claim 19.

For the reasons above, the Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Bromer

January 14, 2005
Date

Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Telefax : (202) 408-0924